United Nations E/AC.51/2002/3

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: Limited
18 April 2002

Original: English

Committee for Programme and Coordination
Forty-second session
Organizational session
13 May 2002
Substantive session
10 June-5 July 2002
Item 3 of the provisional agenda*
Review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations

Progress in the preparation of the report of the Secretary-General on different methodologies that might be used to correct the geographical imbalance in hiring consultants

Note by the Secretary-General**

1. Following its consideration of the report of the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) entitled "The use of consultants in the United Nations" (JIU/REP/2002/2, contained in document A/55/59), the Committee for Programme and Coordination (CPC) requested the Secretary-General to study different methodologies which might be used to improve the geographical balance in hiring consultants and to report to it at its forty-second session on workable options to enable Member States to make an informed choice among alternative systems (see A/56/16, para. 454).

2. Previously, in recognition of this concern, the Secretary-General had undertaken to make an effort to limit the number of consultants engaged from any one Member State within a department/office or within an occupational group (see A/54/164, para. 15).

3. As a starting point for further study, the Secretariat took note of important considerations set out by JIU in its report on the use of consultants. In that report, JIU said that it would be difficult to extend and apply the methodology of the system of the desirable ranges for staff to the consultants, since, unlike the system for staff, a stable core of consultants does not exist (see JIU/REP/2000/2, para. 79).

* E/AC.51/2002/1.

** The document was submitted late to the conference services without the explanation required under paragraph 8 of General Assembly resolution 53/208 B, by which the Assembly decided that, if a report is submitted late, the reason should be included in a footnote to the document.

02-34276 (E) 030502

For the same reasons, a separate system of national quotas for consultants would have the same drawback. JIU went on to suggest a method of indexing the geographical distribution of consultants based on the system of desirable ranges applied to professional staff as a reference point. In order to facilitate the advancement of the discussion on this topic, the present note contains a version of such a system for consideration by Member States.

4. The established system of desirable ranges for staff members is the only existing system of geographical representation norms approved by the General Assembly. The system is a mathematic formula that builds from a base figure to calculate a midpoint and desirable range derived from membership, population and contribution factors for each Member State. Any alternative system would require the achievement of a new policy consensus.

5. As an example of how the application of the existing system of desirable ranges for staff could apply to consultants and individual contractors, annex I compares by Member State the weighted values for the fractional numbers of consultants hired and the related fees spent in 2000 to comparable weighted fractional values of the midpoint in the desirable range.[1] The comparison uses the 2000 data on consultants and the geographical staff midpoint situation of February 2002, which is based on the new scale of assessments. Although the table was developed according to parameters that may need further refinement, they demonstrate a certain relationship between numbers and fees of consultants and geographical representation status.

6. When a country's weighted person and fee fraction of the consultants hired in 2000 is applied to the midpoint fraction for the same country, the comparison shows a not otherwise obvious result with respect to consultants' representation. Member States for which there is a nearly exact correlation between consultants hired in 2000 and what they would be entitled to under this system of desirable ranges are shown in annex II, column 1. Some countries have fewer consultants than their midpoint fraction would warrant, as indicated in annex II, column 2. For this group of countries, more of their nationals would have to be engaged, at higher costs, to correct this perceived imbalance. Finally, a number of Member States have more consultants than their midpoint fraction would warrant; these are shown in annex II, column 3. For this group of countries, measures would have to be devised to reduce the number and cost of their nationals engaged as consultants in order to correct this perceived imbalance.

7. For 2000 annex III (with February 2002 midpoints) provides the same comparison by categories of national economies — developing, developed and in transition — divided into those countries whose nationals provided consultants and individual contractors and those whose nationals did not.[2] Some 41 Member States (21.7 per cent of the total) did not provide any consultants or individual contractors to the Secretariat in 2000. As shown in annex III, each national economy grouping reaches more than 82 per cent of "target representation".

8. In order to be able to evaluate the full extent of the consequences of applying a system of geographical quotas to the hiring of consultants, the Secretary-General would need to initiate an in-depth multi-year study aimed at designing and setting up an operational reporting subsystem that would allow for continuous feedback and monitoring regarding not only the nationality of the consultants hired but also the nationality of the short-listed candidates not hired. By tracking data on available,

non-hired candidates over a period of years, it would then be possible to ascertain whether there are significant opportunities to change the present distribution and to assess the related financial implications, if any. It should be pointed out that the current Integrated Management Information System does not allow for the tracking of short-listed candidates for a consultancy assignment who were available but not hired. Should this study be authorized, the Secretary-General would propose to calculate the related financial implications, follow the funding approval process and report back on the results at a session taking place three years after the study began.

9. In the meantime, it would appear prudent to proceed only after receiving some guidance from the General Assembly on the subject of applicable norms. Without agreed norms, it is impossible to characterize the nationality distribution of consultants and contractors as unbalanced or, for that matter, balanced.

10. As an additional consideration, the Committee for Programme and Coordination may wish to devote some attention to the overall impact of the nationality distribution of consultants. During 2000, the latest period for which current data on consultants and individual contractors is available, just less than $42 million was spent on such services. In that same period, total United Nations financial activity amounted to more than $10 billion. Thus, only some 0.42 per cent of the Organization's resources that year were devoted to consultants and individual contractors.

11. During that same period, as in years past, the most powerful expression of the idea of equitable geographic representation related to staff, where the bulk of the Organization's resources were expended. The overall geographic representation of staff closely matched, with a few exceptions, the established targets for equitable geographic distribution. For nearly all countries where some action is needed to correct underrepresentation or overrepresentation, the number of appointments or separations required to achieve perfect correspondence with the targets is marginal.

Notes

[1] Annex I is based on the data included in the report of the Secretary-General of 26 February 2002 on consultants and individual contractors for 2000 (A/56/834). In order to allow for effective and valid comparisons of the number of consultants and individual contractors hired and the fees paid with the system of desirable ranges, a common comparator for persons, fees and midpoints needed to be developed. This comparator was developed on a basis of 100 by fractioning each element item as compared to the sum of the element items (100) of each element. A weighted average was calculated by lumping together person fractions and fee fractions on a weighted distribution of 55 per cent for the fees and 45 per cent for the persons. This distribution ratio was chosen following the weight of 55 per cent given to Member States' contributions in the calculation of their midpoint of the range in the system of desirable ranges for staff.

[2] Groupings of Member States are derived from the *World Economic and Social Survey 2001: Trends and Policies in the World Economy* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.01.II.C.1).

Annex I

Comparison of consultants with geographical representation midpoints, using a weighted fraction methodology for Member States whose nationals were employed in 2000

	(a)	(b)	(c)**	(d)	(e)
Country	*Percentage of total persons*	*Percentage of total fees*	*Weighted average (a) and (b)*	*Percentages of total midpoints (February 2002)*	*e=(c)-(d)*
Afghanistan*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.23%	-0.23%
Albania	0.40%	0.07%	0.22%	0.22%	0.00%
Algeria	0.27%	0.21%	0.24%	0.28%	-0.04%
Andorra*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.21%	-0.21%
Angola*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.22%	-0.22%
Antigua and Barbuda	0.07%	0.25%	0.17%	0.21%	-0.04%
Argentina	2.23%	1.48%	1.81%	0.88%	0.93%
Armenia*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.22%	-0.22%
Australia	2.28%	1.69%	1.96%	1.13%	0.83%
Austria	1.01%	0.88%	0.94%	0.74%	0.20%
Azerbaijan	0.02%	0.01%	0.02%	0.22%	-0.20%
Bahamas	0.02%	0.02%	0.02%	0.22%	-0.20%
Bahrain*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.22%	-0.22%
Bangladesh	0.49%	0.74%	0.63%	0.33%	0.30%
Barbados	0.12%	0.20%	0.16%	0.22%	-0.05%
Belarus	0.10%	0.05%	0.07%	0.23%	-0.16%
Belgium	0.82%	1.13%	0.99%	0.85%	0.14%
Belize*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.21%	-0.21%
Benin	0.10%	0.06%	0.08%	0.22%	-0.14%
Bhutan*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.21%	-0.21%
Bolivia	0.25%	0.39%	0.33%	0.22%	0.10%
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.72%	0.34%	0.51%	0.22%	0.29%
Botswana	0.02%	0.01%	0.02%	0.22%	-0.20%
Brazil	1.26%	1.13%	1.19%	1.50%	-0.31%
Brunei Darussalam*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.23%	-0.23%
Bulgaria	0.17%	0.24%	0.21%	0.23%	-0.02%
Burkina Faso	0.25%	0.17%	0.20%	0.22%	-0.02%
Burundi	0.20%	0.17%	0.18%	0.22%	-0.04%
Cambodia	0.05%	0.01%	0.03%	0.22%	-0.20%
Cameroon	0.96%	1.01%	0.99%	0.23%	0.76%
Canada	3.39%	6.84%	5.28%	1.66%	3.63%
Cape Verde*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.21%	-0.21%
Central African Republic*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.22%	-0.22%
Chad	0.10%	0.06%	0.08%	0.22%	-0.14%
Chile	4.45%	2.30%	3.27%	0.33%	2.94%
China	1.14%	1.54%	1.36%	2.12%	-0.76%
Colombia	1.14%	1.36%	1.26%	0.34%	0.92%
Comoros*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.21%	-0.21%

Country	(a) Percentage of total persons	(b) Percentage of total fees	(c)** Weighted average (a) and (b)	(d) Percentages of total midpoints (February 2002)	e=(c)-(d)
Congo	0.12%	0.26%	0.20%	0.21%	-0.01%
Costa Rica	0.25%	0.16%	0.20%	0.23%	-0.03%
Côte d'Ivoire	0.35%	0.37%	0.36%	0.23%	0.13%
Croatia	0.74%	0.55%	0.64%	0.24%	0.40%
Cuba	0.17%	0.07%	0.12%	0.24%	-0.12%
Cyprus	0.07%	0.11%	0.09%	0.23%	-0.14%
Czech Republic	0.15%	0.22%	0.19%	0.31%	-0.12%
Democratic People's Republic of Korea*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.24%	-0.24%
Democratic Republic of the Congo	0.12%	0.13%	0.13%	0.26%	-0.13%
Denmark	0.59%	0.24%	0.40%	0.63%	-0.23%
Djibouti	0.15%	0.05%	0.10%	0.21%	-0.12%
Dominica*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.21%	-0.21%
Dominican Republic	0.10%	0.09%	0.10%	0.23%	-0.14%
Ecuador	0.30%	0.16%	0.22%	0.24%	-0.02%
Egypt	1.48%	1.22%	1.34%	0.31%	1.03%
El Salvador	0.10%	0.10%	0.10%	0.23%	-0.13%
Equatorial Guinea*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.21%	-0.21%
Eritrea*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.22%	-0.22%
Estonia	0.07%	0.03%	0.05%	0.22%	-0.17%
Ethiopia	7.59%	4.45%	5.86%	0.27%	5.60%
Fiji	0.27%	0.16%	0.21%	0.21%	0.00%
Finland	0.64%	1.64%	1.19%	0.51%	0.69%
France	5.32%	6.20%	5.80%	3.84%	1.96%
Gabon	0.05%	0.03%	0.04%	0.22%	-0.18%
Gambia	0.20%	0.17%	0.18%	0.21%	-0.03%
Georgia	0.02%	0.02%	0.02%	0.22%	-0.20%
Germany	1.98%	1.93%	1.95%	5.70%	-3.74%
Ghana	0.67%	0.93%	0.81%	0.23%	0.58%
Greece	0.22%	0.26%	0.24%	0.52%	-0.28%
Grenada*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.21%	-0.21%
Guatemala	0.27%	0.13%	0.19%	0.24%	-0.04%
Guinea	0.15%	0.09%	0.12%	0.22%	-0.10%
Guinea-Bissau*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.21%	-0.21%
Guyana	0.07%	0.14%	0.11%	0.21%	-0.10%
Haiti	0.07%	0.08%	0.08%	0.22%	-0.14%
Honduras	0.02%	0.03%	0.03%	0.22%	-0.19%
Hungary	0.27%	0.18%	0.22%	0.29%	-0.06%
Iceland	0.10%	0.12%	0.11%	0.23%	-0.12%
India	2.33%	3.11%	2.76%	1.23%	1.52%
Indonesia	0.47%	0.40%	0.43%	0.50%	-0.07%
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	0.30%	0.40%	0.35%	0.39%	-0.04%
Iraq	0.12%	0.14%	0.13%	0.29%	-0.16%
Ireland	0.89%	1.05%	0.98%	0.38%	0.60%
Israel	0.27%	0.50%	0.40%	0.45%	-0.05%
Italy	1.43%	2.20%	1.86%	3.07%	-1.21%

Country	(a) Percentage of total persons	(b) Percentage of total fees	(c)** Weighted average (a) and (b)	(d) Percentages of total midpoints (February 2002)	(e) e=(c)-(d)
Jamaica	0.15%	0.29%	0.23%	0.22%	0.01%
Japan	0.52%	0.61%	0.57%	11.14%	-10.57%
Jordan	0.52%	0.45%	0.48%	0.22%	0.26%
Kazakhstan	0.05%	0.06%	0.05%	0.24%	-0.19%
Kenya	2.10%	2.09%	2.09%	0.24%	1.85%
Kiribati*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.21%	-0.21%
Kuwait	0.02%	0.01%	0.02%	0.29%	-0.28%
Kyrgyzstan	0.02%	0.00%	0.01%	0.22%	-0.20%
Lao People's Democratic Rep.	0.10%	0.03%	0.06%	0.22%	-0.16%
Latvia*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.22%	-0.22%
Lebanon	1.68%	0.81%	1.20%	0.22%	0.98%
Lesotho*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.21%	-0.21%
Liberia	0.17%	0.28%	0.23%	0.21%	0.02%
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.25%	-0.25%
Liechtenstein*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.21%	-0.21%
Lithuania*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.22%	-0.22%
Luxembourg*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.26%	-0.26%
Madagascar*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.23%	-0.23%
Malawi	0.07%	0.03%	0.05%	0.22%	-0.17%
Malaysia	0.54%	0.43%	0.48%	0.36%	0.12%
Maldives	0.02%	0.02%	0.02%	0.21%	-0.19%
Mali	0.22%	0.11%	0.16%	0.22%	-0.06%
Malta	0.07%	0.04%	0.05%	0.22%	-0.17%
Marshall Islands*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.21%	-0.21%
Mauritania	0.20%	0.13%	0.16%	0.21%	-0.06%
Mauritius	0.10%	0.04%	0.07%	0.22%	-0.15%
Mexico	0.74%	0.74%	0.74%	0.89%	-0.16%
Micronesia (Federated States of)*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.21%	-0.21%
Monaco*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.21%	-0.21%
Mongolia	0.07%	0.02%	0.04%	0.21%	-0.17%
Morocco	0.40%	0.48%	0.44%	0.26%	0.18%
Mozambique	0.07%	0.24%	0.16%	0.23%	-0.06%
Myanmar	0.17%	0.05%	0.10%	0.26%	-0.15%
Namibia	0.05%	0.25%	0.16%	0.22%	-0.06%
Nauru*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.21%	-0.21%
Nepal	0.42%	0.13%	0.26%	0.23%	0.03%
Netherlands	1.53%	1.55%	1.54%	1.19%	0.35%
New Zealand	0.57%	0.56%	0.56%	0.35%	0.22%
Nicaragua	0.07%	0.10%	0.09%	0.22%	-0.13%
Niger	0.10%	0.17%	0.14%	0.22%	-0.08%
Nigeria	0.67%	0.53%	0.59%	0.34%	0.26%
Norway	0.89%	0.87%	0.88%	0.57%	0.31%
Oman*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.25%	-0.25%
Pakistan	0.40%	0.47%	0.44%	0.36%	0.08%
Palau*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.21%	-0.21%
Panama	0.02%	0.01%	0.02%	0.22%	-0.21%

Country	(a) Percentage of total persons	(b) Percentage of total fees	(c)** Weighted average (a) and (b)	(d) Percentages of total midpoints (February 2002)	(e) e=(c)-(d)
Papua New Guinea	0.02%	0.00%	0.01%	0.22%	-0.21%
Paraguay	0.10%	0.00%	0.04%	0.23%	-0.18%
Peru	0.79%	1.34%	1.09%	0.30%	0.80%
Philippines	1.34%	1.21%	1.27%	0.33%	0.94%
Poland	0.25%	0.14%	0.19%	0.42%	-0.23%
Portugal	0.17%	0.14%	0.15%	0.48%	-0.32%
Qatar*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.23%	-0.23%
Republic of Korea	0.37%	0.26%	0.31%	1.28%	-0.97%
Republic of Moldova	0.02%	0.05%	0.04%	0.22%	-0.18%
Romania	0.25%	0.14%	0.19%	0.26%	-0.07%
Russian Federation	1.43%	2.02%	1.76%	0.99%	0.76%
Rwanda	0.35%	0.27%	0.30%	0.22%	0.08%
Saint Kitts and Nevis*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.21%	-0.21%
Saint Lucia*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.21%	-0.21%
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.21%	-0.21%
Samoa	0.10%	0.02%	0.06%	0.21%	-0.15%
San Marino*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.21%	-0.21%
Sao Tome and Principe*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.21%	-0.21%
Saudi Arabia	0.12%	0.03%	0.07%	0.54%	-0.46%
Senegal	0.74%	0.84%	0.80%	0.22%	0.58%
Seychelles	0.02%	0.01%	0.02%	0.21%	-0.19%
Sierra Leone	0.32%	0.10%	0.20%	0.22%	-0.02%
Singapore	0.17%	0.17%	0.17%	0.43%	-0.26%
Slovakia	0.12%	0.09%	0.11%	0.24%	-0.13%
Slovenia	0.10%	0.03%	0.06%	0.26%	-0.19%
Solomon Islands	0.05%	0.00%	0.02%	0.21%	-0.19%
Somalia	0.02%	0.02%	0.02%	0.22%	-0.20%
South Africa	0.87%	1.05%	0.97%	0.47%	0.50%
Spain	1.01%	0.68%	0.83%	1.64%	-0.81%
Sri Lanka	0.52%	0.25%	0.37%	0.24%	0.14%
Sudan	0.32%	0.14%	0.22%	0.24%	-0.02%
Suriname	0.05%	0.02%	0.04%	0.21%	-0.18%
Swaziland*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.21%	-0.21%
Sweden	1.04%	1.52%	1.30%	0.79%	0.51%
Syrian Arab Republic	0.37%	0.24%	0.30%	0.27%	0.03%
Tajikistan	0.05%	0.01%	0.03%	0.22%	-0.19%
Thailand	1.29%	0.56%	0.89%	0.40%	0.48%
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	0.12%	0.04%	0.08%	0.22%	-0.14%
Togo	0.10%	0.05%	0.07%	0.22%	-0.14%
Tonga	0.05%	0.03%	0.04%	0.21%	-0.17%
Trinidad and Tobago	0.17%	0.23%	0.20%	0.22%	-0.02%
Tunisia	0.27%	0.17%	0.21%	0.24%	-0.02%
Turkey	0.10%	0.32%	0.22%	0.51%	-0.29%
Turkmenistan*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.22%	-0.22%
Tuvalu*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.21%	-0.21%

Country	(a) Percentage of total persons	(b) Percentage of total fees	(c)** Weighted average (a) and (b)	(d) Percentages of total midpoints (February 2002)	(e) e=(c)-(d)
Uganda	0.52%	0.53%	0.52%	0.23%	0.29%
Ukraine	0.17%	0.17%	0.17%	0.28%	-0.11%
United Arab Emirates*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.33%	-0.33%
United Kingdom	7.74%	8.25%	8.02%	3.33%	4.69%
United Republic of Tanzania	0.57%	0.71%	0.65%	0.24%	0.40%
United States of America	11.55%	13.98%	12.89%	12.55%	0.34%
Uruguay	0.54%	0.50%	0.52%	0.26%	0.26%
Uzbekistan	0.05%	0.01%	0.03%	0.24%	-0.21%
Vanuatu	0.07%	0.01%	0.04%	0.21%	-0.17%
Venezuela	0.42%	0.39%	0.40%	0.35%	0.06%
Viet Nam	0.30%	0.12%	0.20%	0.28%	-0.08%
Yemen	0.15%	0.07%	0.11%	0.23%	-0.12%
Yugoslavia	0.77%	0.29%	0.51%	0.23%	0.27%
Zambia	0.25%	0.24%	0.24%	0.22%	0.02%
Zimbabwe	0.37%	0.39%	0.38%	0.23%	0.16%
Total	**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**100.00%**	**0.00%**

* Member States (41) whose nationals were not employed as consultants/contractors in 2000.
** (c)=(a x 45/100) + (b x 55/100).

Annex II

Annex I data displayed in three categories: Member States whose representation is identical or nearly identical to the calculated norm (column 1)

Member States whose representation exceeds the calculated norm (column 2) Member States whose representation falls short of the calculated norm (column 3)

1	*2*	*3*	
Within range	*Overrepresented*	*Underrepresented*	
Albania	Argentina	Afghanistan*	Germany
Algeria	Australia	Andorra*	Greece
Antigua and Barbuda	Austria	Angola*	Grenada*
Barbados	Bangladesh	Armenia*	Guinea-Bissau*
Bolivia	Belgium	Azerbaijan	Haiti
Bulgaria	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Bahamas	Honduras
Burkina Faso	Cameroon	Bahrain*	Iceland
Burundi	Canada	Belarus	Iraq
Congo	Chile	Belize*	Italy
Costa Rica	Colombia	Benin	Japan
Ecuador	Côte d'Ivoire	Bhutan*	Kazakhstan
Fiji	Croatia	Botswana	Kiribati*
Gambia	Egypt	Brazil	Kuwait
Guatemala	Ethiopia	Brunei Darussalam*	Kyrgyzstan
Guinea	Finland	Cambodia	Lao People's Democratic Rep.
Guyana	France	Cape Verde*	Latvia*
Hungary	Ghana	Central African Republic*	Lesotho*
Indonesia	India	Chad	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya*
Iran	Ireland	China	Liechtenstein*
Israel	Jordan	Comoros*	Lithuania*
Jamaica	Kenya	Cuba	Luxembourg*
Liberia	Lebanon	Cyprus	Madagascar*
Mali	Malaysia	Czech Republic	Malawi
Mauritania	Morocco	Democratic People's Republic of Korea*	Maldives
Mozambique	Netherlands		Malta
Namibia	New Zealand	Democratic Republic of the Congo	Marshall Islands*
Nepal	Nigeria		Mauritius
Niger	Norway	Denmark	Mexico
Pakistan	Peru	Djibouti	Micronesia*
Romania	Philippines	Dominica*	Monaco*
Rwanda	Russian Federation	Dominican Republic	Mongolia
Sierra Leone	Senegal	El Salvador	Myanmar
Sudan	South Africa	Equatorial Guinea*	Nauru*
Syrian Arab Republic	Sri Lanka	Eritrea*	Nicaragua
Trinidad and Tobago	Sweden	Estonia	Oman*
Tunisia	Thailand	Gabon	Palau*

1	2	3	
Within range	*Overrepresented*	*Underrepresented*	
Venezuela	Uganda	Georgia	Panama
Viet Nam	United Kingdom	Papua New Guinea	Solomon Islands
Zambia	United States of America	Paraguay	Somalia
	Uruguay	Poland	Spain
	United Rep. of Tanzania	Portugal	Suriname
	Yugoslavia	Qatar*	Swaziland*
	Zimbabwe	Republic of Korea	Tajikistan
		Republic of Moldova	The former Yugoslav Republic
		Saint Kitts and Nevis*	of Macedonia
		Saint Lucia*	Togo
		Saint Vincent and the	Tonga
		Grenadines*	Turkey
		Sao Tome and Principe*	Turkmenistan*
		Samoa	Tuvalu*
		San Marino*	Ukraine
		Saudi Arabia	United Arab Emirates*
		Seychelles	Uzbekistan
		Singapore	Vanuatu
		Slovakia	Yemen
		Slovenia	

* Member States (41) whose nationals were not employed as consultants/contractors in 2000.
Within range: indicates a difference of between -0.1 per cent and 0.1 per cent between the midpoint and the calculated norm.
Overrepresented: indicates a difference of above 0.1 per cent between the midpoint and the calculated norm.
Underrepresented: indicates a difference of below -0.1 per cent between the midpoint and the calculated norm.

Annex III

Comparison of consultant representation by type of economy (Midpoint data of February 2002)

	Consultants		*No Consultants*	
	Midpoint totals	*Percentage*	*Midpoint totals*	*Percentage*
Developed economies	1 390.29	97.8	30.0	2.1
Developing economies	903.76	82.6	191.1	17.4
Economies in transition	166.95	87.6	23.67	12.4